

IDAHO FALLS PLANNING COMMISSION

CITY OF IDAHO FALLS PLANNING DEPARTMENT

P.O. BOX 50220

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO 83405-0220

August 5, 2014

7:00 p.m.

Planning Department
Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners George Swaney, Brent Dixon, James Wyatt, George Morrison, Margaret Wimborne and Kurt Karst.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Natalie Black and Donna Cosgrove.

ALSO PRESENT: Planning Director Brad Cramer, Assistant Planning Director Kerry Beutler and interested citizens.

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Swaney called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and reviewed the public hearing process.

Minutes: Morrison moved to approve the minutes of July 1, 2014. Wimborne seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Public Hearings:

Conditional Use Permit for an Open-Air Pavilion at a Church in the R-1

Zone: **Commission Member Wyatt recused himself.** Beutler presented the staff report, a part of the record. The proposed pavilion has been moved to the northeast corner of the property as requested by the Commission, following neighbor's concerns voiced at July's meeting. Staff also reviewed the history of the property in relation to the buffering requirement for parking areas adjacent to residential uses. The buffer requirement first appears in the 1989 Zoning Ordinance. The church was built in the late 70's and the lilac hedge along the western property line appears in the 1984 aerials of the property, but was removed in the 1988 aerials. There is no record of the hedge being a requirement of the approval of the church site. In light of the research, it is Staff's opinion that the landscape buffer was not a requirement of the approval of the original CUP and was not in effect at the time that the hedge was removed. Dixon asked about buildings on the commercial property to east and their relationship to the church property. Beutler explained the commercial development and future site plan. Morrison pointed out that the grocery store had built a cedar fence around entire commercial property east of the church. Swaney opened the public hearing.

Cory Roberts, NBW Architects, 119 Michelle Drive, Sugar City, Idaho. The Church has tried to address neighbor's concerns that were voiced at last month's meeting by moving pavilion to east side. Events and parking will then naturally move the east side of the property. Dixon asked if any existing trees would be removed. Roberts said he didn't believe that it would. It is the property owner's desire to preserve the trees.

Hearing no addition comments Swaney closed the hearing.

Planning Commission minutes August 5 2014

Page 1 of 4

"PLANNING FOR A BETTER IDAHO FALLS"

AUTHORIZED AND ESTABLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH 1935 IDAHO SESSION LAWS (EXTRAORDINARY SESSION) CHAPTER 51, BY
RESOLUTION OF THE HON. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO

Wimborne said the new proposal addresses concerns of the commission and neighbors. She then moved to approve a Conditional Use Permit for an Open-Air Pavilion at a Church in the R-1 Zone. Morrison 2nd the motion and it passed unanimously.

Reasoned statement: Morrison moved to approve the Reasoned Statement for the Conditional Use Permit for an Open-Air Pavilion at a Church in the R-1 Zone. Wimborne 2nd the motion and it passed unanimously.

Adoption of Updated Social and Economic Profile of Idaho Falls and Bonneville County and Background Studies of the Idaho Falls Comprehensive Plan: Beutler summarized the questions and comments from the Bonneville County Planning Commission. There were questions about capacity of water and sewer lines. The report does address those issues, but staff expects additional research and conversations regarding those items as discussions around the City's Area of Impact begin with the County. Swaney said he felt the County Planning Commission was impressed with the level of detail provided by the documents. Swaney opened the public hearing. Hearing no comments Swaney closed the hearing.

Karst moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council adoption of the Updated Social and Economic Profile of Idaho Falls and Bonneville County and Background Studies of the Idaho Falls Comprehensive Plan. Morrison 2nd the motion and it passed unanimously.

Business Items:

Final Plat Kingwood Addition, Div. 1, 1st Amended: Beutler presented the staff report, a part of the record. The proposed subdivision includes three lots at the corner of Sunnyside and Hitt Roads. No access will be allowed from Sunnyside Road and only a joint access will be allowed from Hitt Road at the south end of the property. The applicant will provide for a cross access agreement to address the restricted access. The Commission had no questions for staff. Swaney invited the applicant to speak.

Blake Jolley, Harper-Leavitt Engineering, 985 N. Capital, Idaho Falls. Jolley stated that the applicant understands there is no direct access to Sunnyside or Hitt Roads and a cross-access will be provided. There is an interested party wanting to develop north parcel.

Dixon moved to recommend to the City Council approval of the final plat of Kingwood Addition, Div. 1, 1st Amended as presented. Karst 2nd the motion and it passed unanimously.

Planned Unit Development discussion: Beutler reviewed staff report and changes made to concept language since the last discussion in June. Dixon asked if the proposed streetscape setbacks were consistent with regular zoning. He was concerned that open space was being pushed to the exterior. Beutler said the proposed language does not count the landscape strip as common space. Wimborne asked if pedestrian requirements were required throughout the development. Beutler clarified that if a development was providing sidewalks beyond the sidewalks adjacent to street rights-of-way they would need to address the additional pedestrian

standards. Swaney clarified that the required parking lot landscaping is not part of the common space.

Beutler discussed changes that were made to the common space. Previous language required 20% common space with what could be included within that calculation with regard to setbacks and streetscapes. There were concerns that some of these areas were usable open space but the language would prevent them from being able to be counted. In order to address this issue simply, staff increased the common space requirement to 25%, but removed language eliminating the ability to count setbacks into the calculation. Required buffers and streetscapes would still be excluded from the common space calculation. Beutler indicated that staff still has a question if one amenity was the appropriate amount or if it should be more. Wimborne said she felt that one amenity was appropriate. She liked the language that the number of amenities should increase as the size of the development increases.

Dixon commented about the objectives and said that only one of the listed purposes was not related to flexibility and that was the amenities. The common space and amenity requirements seem to say the main purpose is to provide public space. Wimborne feels that is the tradeoff for the flexibility. Beutler said the other objective is to provide a higher standard for development and ensure public benefit through redevelopment in exchange for the flexibility.

Beutler presented the portion of the language that dealt with project phasing. Wimborne asked about the word "consecutive" being removed from the phasing language. Beutler said it was to ensure there wasn't a lot of starting and stopping. Morrison suggested it should be 18 months from approval. Karst agreed. Dixon clarified that open space and amenities are required during the first phase of construction. Karst agreed with that concept.

Beutler then addressed the proposed amendment process for a PUD. Karst asked for clarification on administrative approval to amending building locations. Beutler clarified the language relating to the width of a building. Dixon asked about the changes in number of dwelling units and number of lots. He recommended the language just refer to a change rather than an increase. This would allow for potential decreases. Swaney likes the idea of defining major and minor changes. Dixon suggested that item C under minor changes relating to the common space should be allowed to become a major change at staff's discretion.

Morrison stated that he likes the concept. He asked for copies of the slides to be distributed to the Planning Commission for review. Wimborne asked about public comments. Beutler said two developers have reviewed the concept and provided suggestions. He said we are trying to find something that works for both parties.

Dixon asked how the increased density compares to the normal zones. Cramer answered density increases were anywhere from 1-4 units per acre more than the underlying zoning.

Dixon asked about commercial PUDs and why someone would want to do a commercial PUD. Beutler said one component would be the mix of uses, allowing for a use that is not within the zone district and also a variation on parking. Dixon asked if apartments could be built in industrial zones or some commercial zones if it was a PUD. Beutler said the zone's uses remain the same in the PUD. Any changes or additional uses to the underlying zone would have to be

approved by the planning commission and council. There was discussion about how uses would be regulated.

Cramer asked the Planning Commission if they thought the proposed language was ready to start working with the City Attorney to develop the concept into an ordinance. Wimborne said she thinks it is ready for moving forward to an ordinance. She suggested staff work with developers to make sure the ordinance is workable. Dixon likes the concept but is worried it might make PUDs too expensive to develop. He would like more time to look at "should's" vs. "shall's" and what is higher quality. Karst agreed with making sure "should" language is cleaned up in the ordinance. Morrison and Wyatt agreed it was okay to move toward an ordinance.

Bonneville County Report: Swaney reiterated that the County Planning Commission was impressed with the work staff did on the studies supporting the Comprehensive Plan. He said that being on the County Planning Commission has helped him develop a greater appreciation for City staff and the work they do. Cramer discussed the need to look for a date and time for a future joint City and County Planning Commission meeting. He also asked for the possible topics to include on that meeting agenda. The Commission provided the following as possible topics: Comparison of County and City Ordinances and where any differences might be, Right-of-way connections, Commission involvement when City and County projects are interfacing, and Infrastructure development and transition between jurisdictions.

Respectfully Submitted

Kerry Beutler, Assistant Director